arXiv:cond-mat/0304214v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 9 Apr 2003

Response to "Comment on 'time-dependent density-matrix renormalization group: a systematic method for the study of quantum many-body out-of-equilibrium systems' " by H. G. Luo, T. Xiang, and X. Q. Wang

M. A. Cazalilla
Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC), P. Manuel de Lardizabal 4, 20018 Donostia, Spain

J. B. Marston
Department of Physics, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912-1843, USA

The authors of the Comment[1] propose an improvement to our TdDMRG algorithm as described in our Letter[2], providing few details about the proposed extension. Luo, Xiang, and Wang (LXW) then point out that the oscillations at late times ($t > 18$) shown in two of the lines plotted in Fig. 2 of our manuscript are an artifact of the truncation of the Hilbert space.

LXW are correct that the oscillations we reported in the one case of $V/w = 1.1$ are in fact spurious. We had systematically examined the errors induced by truncations of the Hilbert space in our Letter. However we failed to notice that, for the case of $V/w = 1.1$ when the leads are insulating, the eigenvalues of the reduced density matrices become so small so quickly (due to the gap to excitations) that our code discarded the same portion of the Hilbert space for truncations M=256 and 512. Thus in this one case we were left with the illusion that we had achieved convergence, when in fact we had not.

Unfortunately the Comment does not provide enough details regarding the construction of the (reduced) density matrix. As Eq. 1 of the Comment shows, LXW's density matrix requires knowledge of the wavefunction at different times; but to obtain the time-evolved wavefunction, one needs the density matrix in the first place. Thus it seems that LXW use an iterative procedure: LXW apparently carry out repeated integrations forward in time for each chain size starting with the shortest chain, of length 4 sites. Once the density matrix is constructed for a chain of a given length, the chain is then lengthened by the addition of two sites via the usual (infinite-size) DMRG algorithm, and the time evolution is repeated again from the beginning. The process is then repeated until a sufficiently long chain is built up, tailored to the particular choice of applied bias. Thus the proposed modification of our TdDMRG algorithm is computationally intensive and time consuming. We further point out that the whole procedure must repeated each time a change is made to the bias or other parameters, as the density matrix is tailored to each particular choice of applied bias or parameters. This is in contrast to the original TdDMRG procedure which runs more quickly as it does not require that the chain be built up again each time the bias or the parameters are changed. And while it seems that LXW have found one way to improve the long-time behavior of the TdDMRG algorithm, it is not at all clear that their procedure is optimal. It is unclear, for instance, how much improvement can be expected in the physical case of electrons with spin, as the Hilbert space is so much larger in that case. Other possible improvements to the original TdDMRG algorithm can be imagined.

Finally, we emphasize that our Letter is substantially correct as the Comment corrects only the case $V/w = 1.1$ shown in Fig. 2 of our Letter. The original TdDMRG scheme itself permits the identification of spurious oscillations at late times. Convergence is tested by checking that observables do not change significantly as M is increased. The results of LXW do not reveal new phenomena not already presented in our Letter, and it remains to be demonstrated whether or not the proposed extension is the optimal one.

[1] H. G. Luo, T. Xiang, X. Q. Wang, cond-mat/0212580.
[2] M. A. Cazalilla and J. B. Marston, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 256403 (2002).